

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment to claim 1 overcomes the rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (SAGAWA, NAKAYAMA, STRNAT):

Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites that the filling material has a particle size between .1 and 15 microns. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose these features.

Sagawa discloses in column 10, lines 5-23 thereof, that the powder material and the resin are forced into the pores of the magnet, and seals the pores in order to improve the corrosion resistance. The powder size is usually 0.05 to 500 μm , preferably 0.1 to 100 μm , and ideally 0.1 to 50 μm . Thus, Sagawa includes a powder size far larger than that recited in claim 1.

The significance of the 15 μm dimension is set forth in the present Specification. Specifically, filler particles over 15 microns in size will fill in only the larger of the spaces between magnetic particles and leave smaller spaces empty. Present Specification, page 7, lines 19-21. Sagawa clearly does not take into consideration that the surface roughness of the magnet is lessened.

Claim 1 further recites that the filling material is mixed with particles of a powdered thermosetting resin, then filled in depressions to allow said magnet to have a surface roughness of less than 3 microns. However, Sagawa neither discloses nor suggests that the surface roughness is set to be less than 3 μm .

This 3 μm value is significant because if the surface roughness is set to be more than 3 μm , the depressions and the projections on the magnet become large, and restoration is

impossible, even by filling the filling material or using the corrosion inhibiting coat. However, Sagawa does not suggest the significance of this value because it does not discuss such a technology.

Nakayama discloses in column 6, lines 24-26 thereof that the surface of the magnet is polished by a method such as barrel polishing, buffing, lapping, and ordinary polishing. As apparent from this description, Nakayama lessens the surface roughness by polishing the surface. Nakayama neither discloses nor suggests that the surface roughness is lessened by filling the filling material in depressions on the surface.

Similarly, Strnat neither discloses nor suggests that the surface roughness is lessened by filling the filling material in depressions on the surface.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-28-04

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501